

CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

VOL. C

Pittsburgh, Pa., September, 1956

No. 5

The State in God's Plan

JOHN MURRAY

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

(This article which appeared in the April 1, 1956 issue of "United Evangelical Action Magazine" is used by permission from the editor of UEA and from Dr. Murray)

The state is a divine institution; it does not owe its origin or authority to human expedient or contract and therefore its sanction does not reside in the consent or will of the subjects. It is true that the form of government and the bounds within which a particular government wields its jurisdiction may be and often have been determined by the will and consent of the governed. At other times government has been imposed by force contrary to the will and consent of the governed, perhaps by conquest from without or by dictatorship from within. It is also true that the constitution of a particular state and the laws by which the constitution is put into effect are frequently of human devising. But the institution of civil government is of divine ordinance, and it is only because government has divine sanction that those who govern may rightfully exercise this authority and those who are governed submit to it. The civil magistrate is the minister of God and he is the minister of God for good (cf. Rom. 13:1-7; I Tim. 2:2; I Pet. 2:13-17). The state, therefore, is not a sinful order, though, as we shall see, sin enters into the execution of the government which the state exercises. The state as an institution is intrinsically good and it ought to promote only what is good and right.

We may not too readily take for granted that the institution of civil government would have had no relevance and would have been entirely unnecessary in a sinless world. Without question the form of civil government and the functions the civil magistrate is called upon to perform are determined to a large extent by the fact of sin and by the necessity of placing restraint upon man's sin-

ful propensities and actions and of executing punishment upon those offenses which violate public order. But it does not follow that civil government as such would be unnecessary and irrelevant in a sinless world. Regulation of life would have been necessary even in sinless and confirmed integrity. And who is to say that something akin to what we know as civil government would not have regulated and directed human relations in a perfect world? The family, for example, would have existed apart from sin, and the family presuppose dependence and subjection. There is some kind of government in the family. Again, there is evidence of a hierarchy among the angelic beings. If so, why should there not have been principality among men even if man had been confirmed in his primitive integrity?

The state, however, as we know it, is an institution ordained by God for man in his fallen condition and the fact of sin determines to a considerable extent the functions which are vested in the civil magistrate. The state has its own distinct sphere of operation and jurisdiction; it is that of guarding, maintaining, and promoting justice, order, and peace. It is the function of the civil magistrate to prevent the encroachment upon, and to guard the exercise of, the God-given liberties, rights and privileges of the citizens. And he must provide against attempts to deprive the citizens of the opportunity to discharge their divine obligations. In maintaining and promoting these ends the civil magistrate is invested with the power of the sword to restrain evil, to punish evil doers, and to promote good (cf. Rom. 13:3, 4; I Pet. 2:14).

(Continued on page 6)

Attorney-General Brown's Opinion on the Bible and Religion in the Public Schools of California

THE SECTIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION ON WHICH THIS OPINION IS BASED:

Article IX, Section 8, "Nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction therein permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of this State."

Article I, Section 4, "The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State."

THE MAIN POINT IN THIS OPINION ARE:

- 1—"The Bible may not be used in the public schools for religious purposes."
- 2—"Religious prayers may not be made a part of the curriculum of the public schools."
- 3—"It is one of the fundamentals of American government that the home and the Church have total responsibility for the religious training of each child."
- 4—"Neither state nor Federal government can pass any laws which aid one religion, all religions, or prefer one religion over another."
- 5—"Reading the sacred writing of the Christian religion in public school classrooms would constitute a governmental preference in favor of Christianity, thus denying to other religions the absolute impartiality commanded by Section 4 of Article I."

BASIS FOR THIS OPINION

The Attorney-General builds his case against the Bible in the California Public Schools almost entirely upon Article IX, Section 8 of the State Constitution which forbids teaching "sectarian or denominational doctrine" in its schools. He concludes that religious and sectarian or denominational mean the same thing. But they do not. This is an unnatural and forced meaning. It is contrary to the dictionary definition, the common usage, and our American legal usage of the terms. They have different meanings according to the ruling of the U. S. Supreme Court in the *Girard* case (2 Howard U. A. 200) and of the Colorado Supreme Court (81 Colo. 276) in which the difference is explained and emphasized.

SECT DEFINED

A sect is defined as "a group dissenting from an established or parent church; one of the organized bodies of Christianity; a denomination." In the religious sense therefore sect is synonymous with denomination. A sect is a segment but Christianity is the whole. Christianity therefore is not a sect. The very fact that "sectarian or denominational doctrine" is prohibited implies that non-sectarian or non-denominational doctrine may be taught, in fact implies that it is expected to be taught. The fact that there are adherents of religions other than Christianity in our country does not mean that these religions are to be placed on a level with

Christianity in this nation declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be a Christian nation. This means that the common laws, institutions, and primary customs and usages are based on the Christian religion. If these were based on several different religions then the Constitution would prohibit any *religious* instruction. But because based on the Christian religion then the State Constitution prohibits *sectarian* or *denominational* doctrine.

As for Article I, Section 4, the framers of the constitution did not have the public schools but the entire population of the State in mind when they inserted a clause guaranteeing "the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference." It presupposes the people of California to be a religious people. It guarantees them freedom of religious profession and worship. Their freedom to worship is not limited in any way when the Bible is read and prayer is offered in the public schools, especially when those opposing religious exercises are not required to participate in them. For a minority to insist on no religious exercises as against a majority desiring religious exercises, when that minority is under no compulsion to participate, is not religious liberty. It is religious intolerance.

THE STATE'S RELIGIOUS CHARACTER

The state has a moral and religious character of its own. That moral and religious character is determined by its background and heritage. In a country founded by Christian men on Christian principles with Christian institutions and customs, that religious and moral character should be Christian. The state in its operation of government must show preference for some kind of religious principles. As to its own religious character the state cannot be neutral. In its department of education the state cannot be neutral for its teaches on the basis of the Christian religion or on the basis of the religion of Naturalism.

The Preamble to our State constitution declares that our freedom comes from Almighty God. This can be none other than the God of the Bible, and if we are to preserve our freedom the state is bound to impart a knowledge of Almighty God to each succeeding generation. This it can do only by the use of the Bible in its public schools. What the first amendment to the U. S. Constitution guarantees is freedom *of* religion, not freedom *from* religion. The equal guarantee of religious freedom is provided in our public schools when non-sectarian religious exercises are offered, and all the pupils are free to participate in them.

WHAT THIS OPINION MEANS

From a practical point of view this opinion means no Bible, no prayer, no religion, no God in our public schools. It means a Godless, Christless, atheistic system of public education in this country declared by the Supreme Court to be a Christian nation. We note some results that would follow if this opinion were carried out to its logical conclusion.

- 1—The Preamble to the Constitution of California could not be taught in the schools of our State. "We the people of California, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom . . . do ordain this Constitution."

There is here an acknowledgment of God as the source of our freedom, and an expression of gratitude to Him for our freedom. This is religion, and the teaching of religion is prohibited according to this ruling.

- 2—Nor could the Declaration of Independence be taught in our public schools.

The Declaration is decidedly a religious document. In it the Divine Being is named four times under as many titles—Creator, God of nature, Supreme Judge of the World, and Divine Providence.

Directly, and by implication, tremendous claims are here made for Him. He is the Creator of all men and of the universe, and the sovereign Ruler of all. He is the supreme Lawgiver and Judge of the world. It is He who has endowed all men with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These are great foundation truths on which our Founding Fathers established our nation. But they are religious truths, and so cannot be taught to our boys and girls in our public schools.

- 3—It means that prayers must be excluded. 'Religious prayers may not be made a part of the curriculum of the public schools.'

This is a curious ruling. Are there prayers which are non-religious? If so, to whom are they addressed? Prayer is sacred. When the Attorney-General suggests that there are non-religious prayers is he not trifling with the sacred? Does this imply that the religion of Naturalism is creeping into our public schools?

- 4—It strikes at many of our most cherished customs and institutions.

"Neither a state nor the Federal Government . . . can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another."

This is a statement that is contrary to fact. The truth is that both the State and Federal Government have enacted many laws which violate the above statement, and when put to the test in our courts, they have very generally sustained them.

- a—If the above statement were true we would have to do away with our Christian calendar. By this calendar we date all our official documents. Many

of the more important ones conclude with "Done in the year of our Lord . . ." This calendar is based on an event that Christians consider to be of transcendent importance—THE BIRTH OF CHRIST. This is a recognition of religion by our government and nation, and a preferential recognition of Christianity over other religions.

- b—If Mr. Brown's statement is true then the use of the oath in inducting public officials into office and in our courts of justice would have to be discontinued.

Taking the oath is a religious act, an important recognition of God by the State. It thus brings God in as affording the strongest bond to faithfulness in public office, and to truthfulness in the administration of justice in our courts. "Do you promise—as you shall answer to God—?" "I do, So help me God." Yet the God to whom this appeal is made in our courts must not be mentioned in our public schools.

- c—Mr. Brown's statement is contradicted by the laws in 12 states which require the reading of the Bible in their public schools, and by the laws or court decisions which permit its reading in many other states.

- d—Mr. Brown's statement is contradicted by the laws in our own state, and in the nation, giving the Bible and religious instruction a large place in our prisons and reformatories, and appointing chaplains to that end.

- e—Mr. Brown's statement is contradicted by the employment of chaplains for religious ministrations to our armed forces, and the appropriation of money for the building of chapels for the worship of the true God as revealed in the Bible.

- f—Mr. Brown's statement is contradicted by the fact that church property is now by law excluded from taxation. This is an "aid" to religion to the extent of many millions of dollars.

- 5—The Attorney-General asserts "It is one of the fundamentals of American government that the home and the church have total responsibility for the religious training of each child."

If this statement were true then the state would have no responsibility for any religious training of the 30 million youths in its schools. But the statement is not true. This endeavor to make it one of the fundamentals of American government is an attempt to set the state's educational program against religious education by the church and the home. A state system of education that leaves out the Bible and non-sectarian religion based on the Bible is not neutral towards the Bible and the revelation of God, man, sin, and salvation contained therein, but positively against them. A distinguished American religious leader has said:

"Neutrality (toward religion) is absolutely impossible in education. By the mere fact that re-

(Concluded on page 6)

THE CHRISTIAN STATESMAN

Devoted to Christian Political and Social Science

*Founded in 1867**Official Organ of***THE NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION**

An organization of Christian citizens founded in 1863

*Published Bi-Monthly*January, March, May, July, September and November
at the Association's Headquarters, 209 Ninth St.,J. RENWICK PATTERSON, D.D., Editor
Pittsburgh 22, Pa.

Rate, \$1.50 a year, payable in advance.

"Second class mail privileges authorized at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania."

**PROPORTION OF DRINKERS APPARENTLY
INCREASING**

During 1955 the people of America drank a total of 2,955,731,050 gallons of alcoholic beverages, enough to fill 369,466 rail-road tank cars, enough to provide 17.99 gallons for every man, woman and child making up the population of 164,280,000 persons in the United States.

Of the above total, 199,570,748 gallons (1.21 gallons per capita) were distilled spirits, 144,187,753 gallons (.818 gallons per capita) were wine, and 2,611,972,549 gallons (15.9 gallons per capita) were beer.

There was an increase in total consumption in 1955 over 1944 of 67,728,219 gallons. Consumption of distilled spirits increased 10,100,060, wine 2,031,679, and beer 55,233,431 gallons in 1955 over the previous year. The per capita consumption remained practically the same as in 1954.

How account for this increased consumption? If all the persons who drank in 1954 continued to consume the same amount in 1955, it would mean that 3,783,699 new drinkers, each consuming the national per capita average, would be necessary to account for this increased consumption, a number three-quarters of a million greater than the increase in population during the same period. But in addition to these at least an additional million new drinkers would be necessary to fill up the place of the drinkers who died during the period. We are forced to the conclusion that a higher proportion of the population were drinkers in 1955 than in 1954.

It is undoubtedly true that many who had been drinkers in '54 became heavier drinkers in '55. Some who had been occasional drinkers became regular drinkers, some who had been regular moderate drinkers became heavy drinkers, some who had been heavy drinkers became addictive drinkers, and some who had been addictive drinkers became chronics.

But in addition to these, and this is the sad part, millions who had not been drinkers at all in '54 became drinkers in '55. Many of these came from the ranks of the teen-agers—the crop of youth on which the brewers, vintners and distillers have been banking for increased sales, greater consumption and larger profits.

The above picture is alarming when it is observed that we now have 4,589,000 alcoholics and over 3,000,000 additional problem drinkers in the United States and that the total of these is increasing at the rate of 250,000 a year resulting from the consumption of beverage alcohol. With intoxicating drink producing such an enormous volume of wasted manpower and ruined lives, to say nothing of the many other serious problems resulting therefrom, it is imperative that every possible effort be put forth to promote temperance education and the cause of total abstinence.

**CHRIST, SAVIOUR OF MEN AND KING
OF NATIONS**

The National Reform Association, as specifically stated in its original constitution, which constitution was reaffirmed at the first annual meeting of the Association following the securing of its charter in 1909, was established and pursues its work on the basis of the following principles:

Jesus Christ is King of the Nations.

His law is the rightful law of their existence.

Their governments are under His authority.

They are responsible to Him as nations.

He preserves and rewards them as nations for their national righteousness.

He chastises them as nations for their national sins and scatters them in judgment when their cup of wrong is filled.

As their sphere is of this world and their duration is of time, their reward and their punishment are in this world and of this world's time.

Nations, for their preservation, must be brought to the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A nation to be Christian must acknowledge in its fundamental law the authority of Jesus Christ and the supremacy of His law and must seek to maintain a national life consistent with this acknowledgment.

The Christian Statesman, the official organ of the National Reform Association is dedicated to propagating these principles and to promoting such reforms in our national life as are, in the light of the Word of God, consistent with them, and in keeping with the declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States that "this is a Christian nation."

No nation in all the earth today fully submits itself, as a nation, to His authority and lives His law in its national life. Even in nations which call themselves by His name, there is an appeal to His power without a corresponding submission to His will.

The peril of nations is beyond mortal control. The woe of nations is deeper than mortal remedy. Jesus Christ the Divine Ruler alone is adequate. Submission to His authority and obedience to His law alone can preserve order and peace within and restore order and peace without.

IT IS NOW "THE BIG FIVE" DISTILLERS

Seagram, Schenley, National Distillers and Hiram Walker have long held the field as the so-called big four among the distillers. A fifth contender has now entered the top ranks to offer vigorous competition.

The purchase on August 28th of the Jack Daniel Distillery, Lynchburg, Tennessee, by Brown-Forman Distillers Corporation, Louisville, for the reported sum of \$20,000,000 brings Brown-Forman into the ranks of the big distillers.

This purchase, it is reported, will bring no change in Jack Daniel advertising policy. It is estimated that in 1955 Jack Daniel spent between \$500,000 and \$600,000 in national advertising, largely in newspapers, magazines, and outdoor. The tone of advertising stressed by this company runs true to form of liquor advertising. It is glamorized, misleading and enticing. The format used in the company's ads since 1954 is a country vista, carrying the line, "Down this quiet shaded lane, a rare, Tennessee whisky is charcoal-mellowed, drop by drop—and friend, that means it's sippin' whisky." The result of such advertising is that the company is now operating at maximum capacity of about 1,000 cases a day, all of which contributes to the increasing number of alcoholics, crimes, accidents, deaths, delinquents, broken homes and other social problems of which liquor is a major cause.

Brown-Forman, which made the purchase, is estimated to have spent between \$4,500,000 and \$5,000,000 in advertising in 1955. Adding to this the \$500,000 to \$600,000 Jack Daniel Advertising expenditure means that Brown-Forman will spend this coming year over \$5,500,000 in advertising. This amounts to approximately 6% of the estimated total amount of money that is being spent in the United States today in the advertising of distilled spirits.

QUEBEC PRELATE HITS INSTITUTIONAL BEER, LIQUOR ADS

Ottawa, Ont., Aug. 29—A Quebec archbishop, speaking to leaders of the province's powerful anti-alcohol movements, has urged a wide publicity campaign in all media "to make known the terrible effects and repercussions of alcoholism."

Most Rev. Charles Eugene Parent, archbishop of Rimouski, lambasted the wide publicity given beer and all other alcoholic beverages in the newspapers and other publications of the province.

Although direct advertising of liquor products is banned under the federal code, some provinces do permit such advertising. But Quebec is not one of them.

(The archbishop and other leaders of the seminar on alcoholism were referring to institutional advertising by various breweries and distilleries.)

Archbishop Parent spoke to leaders of a movement known as the Cercle Lacordaire. The movement is widespread in Quebec and goes into a number of French-speaking parishes of eastern and northern Ontario.

Like Alcoholics Anonymous, the movement is designed to rehabilitate alcoholics, but its methods are different, and the Lacordaire organization goes further, by obtaining blanket pledges to swear off liquor by smaller Lacordaire groups in parishes or smaller municipalities. The pledges are taken by townspeople, whether they drink or not, or whether they are heavy or light drinkers.

Archbishop Parent called for "an awakening of public opinion on the dangers of alcoholism."

"The exploitation of a vice or a weakness of the human individual is a scandal condemned by the basic laws of morality," he said.

He urged a "vigorous and concerted" drive by Catholic Action movements, professional organizations and other patriotic and social groups through the "press, radio and television, so that the terrible effects and repercussions of alcoholism can be better known."

Other leaders at the seminar scored the "propaganda" in favor of beer and liquor "which is frequently disguised in promotions for sporting events."

Dr. Reginald Grand'Maison, president of the Lacordaires in the region of Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere, stated: "When we consider all the methods of publicity employed [by the beer and liquor industry], we cannot remain indifferent before the problem of alcoholism, this evil that gnaws our people."

—Advertising Age.

WELCH UNDER NEW OWNERSHIP

A group of farmers banded together as the National Grape Co-operative Association, Westfield, New York, have purchased the Welch Grape Juice Company for the sum of \$28,600,000, thus bringing to a consummation an option agreement that was drawn up in 1952.

Official transfer of ownership was made September 1 when \$100,000 in Welch common stock was delivered to the Cooperative. "In addition to \$100,000 in cash, the Association paid Welch \$15,000,000 in notes accumulated under the 1952 agreement in exchange for the company's plants and equipment and assumed a \$13,500,000 mortgage representing the value of current assets, good will, acquisitions, improvements and additions since 1952."

National Grape Cooperative Association was formed in 1945 by a group of grape growers in several states. The original membership was 891. Today there are 4,600 members in ten states. Last year the Association delivered 81,000 tons of grapes to Welch.

The company has a \$2,000,000 advertising budget, most of which goes into TV. It had a \$37,000,000 volume of business in 1955.

Welch's grape juice dates back to 1869, when Thomas B. Welch, a dentist, became interested in developing a non-alcoholic wine for use in communion services for his church. His product became so popular that by 1878 he and his son were producing nearly 500 barrels a year. By 1880, the output was 10,000 gallons a year.

Welch's grape juice became nationally known in 1893 at the Chicago World's Fair, where Dr. Welch gave out samples with a lecture on prohibition.

Early advertising stressed this anti-alcoholic theme with such headlines as "The beverage with neither remorse nor regret." William Jennings Bryan, Democratic presidential candidate and later secretary of state in Woodrow Wilson's cabinet, started serving grape juice at official functions. Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels flouted tradition and banned the Navy's rum issue, replacing it with grape juice at the time of World War I.

Up to about six years ago, grape juice advertising emphasized the product's therapeutic value. Then it was advertised as a soft drink and was pushed at soda fountains. In 1950, Welch bought "Howdy Doody" (NBC), and grape juice became a popular favorite of millions of youngsters.

Frozen grape juice was introduced about 1949-50; it is now selling almost as much as the bottled product.

It would be wonderful if this new ownership was to return the policy of the founder in producing only non-alcoholic products. A few years ago the tradition of the company was broken and a table wine in white bottles was introduced, thus dragging the name of Welch from the high standard it had maintained through the years. Would that this company continued to produce none other than "The beverage with neither remorse nor regret." Letters to the new owners urging a return to this policy would be in order.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL BROWN'S OPINION

(Concluded from page 3)

religious and moral training is neglected—non-religious, non-moral—and in consequence an anti-religious and anti-moral ideology is developed. Hence a school from which religion is excluded is bound to become irreligious."

This is to set the state over against the church and the religious home. With the public schools excluding religious training, the result is that almost one-half of our youth are growing up with as little knowledge of God and the Bible as the youth in pagan lands. Yet the atheist and the agnostic must be "protected" from such teaching, according to Mr. Brown's ruling.

6—The Attorney-General asserts "that reading the sacred writings of the Christian religion in public school classrooms would constitute a governmental preference in favor of Christianity, thus denying to other religions the absolute impartiality commanded by Section 4 of Article I."

So Christianity is outlawed in our public schools. Christianity is thus converted into a "sect" and the Bible into a "sectarian book" in spite of the ruling of the State Supreme Court.

No preference must be shown for Christianity in a country declared by the U. S. Supreme Court to be a Christian nation, but preference must be shown for the religion of Naturalism which affords "protection" for the atheist and secularist.

7—If the Bible and non-sectarian religion are admitted into State education, where would we draw the line?

We would of course exclude all sectarian or denominational teaching but include that core of truth common to all denominations as set forth in official statements of truth. Or better still, cull out the religious acknowledgments found in organic utterances in our life as a nation, the religious truth that lies at the foundation of our common laws, and those Christian features that have been embedded in the customs and life of the nation. Those portions of the Bible that have been thus expressed could and should be taught in our public schools. This alone will preserve our nation from being moved from a Christian to a secular atheistic basis, which is the basis of communism.

(This article was prepared and published in pamphlet form by the California Christian Citizens Association, 9400 South Western Ave., Los Angeles, 47, California.)

THE STATE IN GOD'S PLAN

(Continued from page 1)

It is in this light that we must assess the kind of prerogative that belongs to the civil magistrate in executing punishment upon those within his domain who are guilty of crimes and of waging war against aggressors from without. The magistrate is in this regard the minister of God in the fullest sense; he has authorization and commission from God to punish for the evil doing which falls into the category of crime. In other words, he is not only the means decreed in God's providence, for the punishment of evildoers—something that may be said of every instrument, however bad, which executes the divine retribution—but he is God's instituted, authorized, and prescribed instrument for the maintenance of order and the punishment of evil doers. It is this conception of the magistrate's authority, a conception plainly demanded by the terms of Scripture teaching as cited above, that shows the fallacy of the pacifist contention. When the civil magistrate executes just judgment upon the crimes committed

within the sphere of his jurisdiction, he is executing not simply God's decretive will, he is not simply the providential instrument of God's wrath, but he is fulfilling God's preceptive will and it would be a violation of his commitment not to do it. And what is true in respect of his prerogative within his domain applies also to any attempt from without, by aggression or otherwise, to interfere with the order of justice and peace which it is his commission to maintain. When one state unjustly wages war on another, military resistance on the part of the state which is the victim of aggression is nothing more than the application of the same principle by which the civil magistrate executes justice upon the violators of equity, order, and peace within his own domain. When he resists this attempt from without to disrupt the order which it is his duty to maintain, he must do this by his appointed agents, the armed forces. It is futile to maintain that the sword which the civil magistrate bears (Rom. 13:4) is not to be used against aggressors from without as well as against the violators of public order from within.

Since civil government is by divine ordinance it is the creature of God just as directly as is any other of the divinely established institutes. The state does not derive its being or authority from the individual nor from the aggregate of individuals within a certain territory—it does not derive its authority from the will of the individual nor from the collective will of the aggregate of individuals. Neither does it derive its authority from the family nor is it an application to the broader sphere of a community of families of the kind of authority which exists in the family; the state is not an extension of the family principle. And neither does the state derive its authority from the church any more than does the church owe its being to the state. All of this points to the sovereignty of the state within its own realm and it points up the independence of the state within its own well-defined sphere of jurisdiction. All of the basic institutions—the individual, the family, the church, and the state—are coordinate and complementary as creatures of God. And, because so, they are not responsible to one another. They recognize one another. In a true sense they mutually sustain one another. Each institute gratefully acknowledges the functions and prerogatives of the others, takes full advantage of the benefits accruing from the exercise of these functions and prerogatives, and discharges the obligations that are incident to the existence of the others as divine institutions. But the one is not responsible to the other as if it were the creature of that other. It is in this connection that the principle of obligation to God on the part of the state as well as on the part of the individual, the family, and the church needs to be emphasized. Too frequently the conception entertained even by Christians of the state's

function and responsibility is pagan rather than Christian. Whether we wish to call civil magistracy an ordinance of common grace or not, we must not suppose that the civil magistrate in the exercise of his responsibility as magistrate is concerned simply with the natural law as distinguished from supernatural revelation. If the magistrate is invested with his authority by God and therefore responsible to God for the faithful execution of his office, the revealed will of God to the full extent of its bearing upon the proper discharge of civil magistracy must obligate him in the execution of his specific function as the minister of God. Since Scripture is the revealed will of God and since Scripture enunciates much of the will of God respecting the proper exercise of civil government, Scripture as well as the light of nature must be regulative for the civil magistrate in the performance of his magisterial functions. Scripture is God's supreme and infallible revelation for all departments of life and civil magistracy is not excluded. The inevitable conclusion is, therefore, that civil government *ought* to be executed in accordance with the principles which Scripture enunciates as the principles of good government. Only thus will the civil magistrate or, in other terms, those in whom is vested the responsibility of government be able to give a good account to Him from whom government is derived and by whom it is ordained.

The state, however, like all institutions in this world, is encompassed with sin. Every state is guilty by sin of omission and commission. No government in this world is perfect. Many governments are godless and their policies wholly inimical to the interest of the kingdom of Christ and of God. Numerous questions arise for the Christian as he contemplates such regimes and particularly when he is placed under necessity of being subject to them. With this complex question we cannot now deal. On only one related question we may briefly reflect.

Divine institution grounds civil government and invests it with a sanction which conscience toward God must recognize (Rom. 13:5). But it is equally necessary to insist that the civil magistrate's authority is strictly circumscribed. It is here that the sinfulness which so often characterizes government finds entrance—the state usurps prerogatives which God has vested in other institutes. No subject pertaining to the theory and practice of government is more germane to our present situation than that of the limits which restrict the prerogatives of government. The state must not itself encroach upon the spheres of those other institutes—the individual, the family, the church; it is its function to *prevent* encroachment upon the liberties, rights and privileges of the citizens and therefore encroachment upon the prerogatives of those other institutes in connection with which these liberties, rights, and

privileges exist. Yet it is in respect of such encroachment and usurpation that some of the greatest evils of our time have occurred and the foundations of justice, order and peace have been destroyed.

It is true we are living in days of revolutionary changes and our survival may seem to require the extension of the powers of the state. Centralization and concentration of power may appear to be the only way of securing protection against aggressive forces from without and of maintaining stability against disruptive forces from within. It is apparent that the only institution in which such power can be concentrated is the state. We must ever be ready to grant that with changing conditions and circumstances governmental regulation and action must be adapted to these new demands. No stereotyped pattern of government or of the ways in which it executes its functions will be equal to the exigencies of each new generation. It is also to be granted that at one time government may properly exercise powers which are neither necessary nor desirable at other times.

But what needs all emphasis is the necessity of vigilance by which we are ever alert to the danger of the intrusion of the state into those spheres which God has severely defined and circumscribed as those of the other institutes. Perhaps no institution is more disposed or tempted to trespass its confines than the state. The comprehensive character of its function makes it almost natural for this tendency to express itself. But for this very reason we need all the more zeal to resist that tendency. However apparent may be the necessity or however appealing may seem to be the benefit, nought can ultimately result from usurpation of prerogative and authority but the baneful captivity by which the individual, the family, and the church are made the bondservants of the state. And we end with the totalitarian state. We Christians are under the necessity of resisting every attempt at such reckless extension of the state's prerogatives. And the principal reason for resistance is that such intrusion on the part of the state is disruption of the divine order, and the advancement of the Kingdom of God in the world cannot coexist with the dissolution of the order which He has ordained. Civil government is exercised by men who are sinful and sin from the beginning has manifested itself in usurpation of prerogative. At the point of investment with power there ever lurks the temptation to grab more power and to exceed the limits of divine ordinance. No task is more exacting than observance of the divine rule and our corporate responsibility requires that we be constantly jealous for the preservation and promotion of the lines of demarcation by which the several institutes of God's established order are defined and within which they must exercise their sovereignty and liberty.

SATURDAY EVENING POSTS NO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADS. POLICY COMPROMISED

The September 15th issue of the *Saturday Evening Post* carries a full page four color ad of the Owens-Illinois no-deposit, no-return bottles, which pictures beer being poured from a bottle, a number of filled glasses and a number of people with beer glasses in their hands; also, a market shopping cart containing a half dozen or so of the "new quart bottles you don't take back." A portion of the ad pictures a bottle with a thermometer inserted and the caption "Keep beer cooler 93% longer." Another caption "Protect beer's flavor peak best!" is followed by several paragraphs of copy proclaiming the virtues of the glass containers in preserving flavor of beers and ales.

Such an ad gives about as strong a plug for beer as the "Home Life" series of the United Brewer's Foundation. It is absolute hypocrisy for a publication to declare that it does not accept beverage alcohol advertising and then to carry such a border-line ad. It is true, the ad does not advertise any particular brand of beer, but it does advertise any kind of beer that can be purchased in Owens-Illinois no-deposit, no-return bottles.

Our protest, sent to the editor, Independence Square, Philadelphia 5, Pa., follows:

"For a number of years we have been listing magazines that do and do not accept advertisements of alcoholic beverages. According to information which you submit to Standard Rate and Data Service, you state that advertisements of alcoholic beverages are not accepted by *The Saturday Evening Post*. We have been circulating this information and have been upholding *The Saturday Evening Post* as a magazine with large circulation and revenue which has not sold out to the liquor interests, and therefore as a magazine which parents can accept into their homes without fear of displaying before the eyes of their children glamorized and enticing advertisements of alcoholic beverages.

"The total effect of your policy is lost, however, when you accept such advertisements as that of the Owens-Illinois no-deposit, no-return beer bottles which you carried in the September 15th issue.

"To declare that your policy is not to carry alcoholic advertisements and then to carry this ad is sheer hypocrisy. The plug for beer in this ad is as strong as in any of the "Home Life" series of United Brewer's Foundation.

"You have many subscribers who take *The Saturday Evening Post* because it provides a home magazine free from liquor ads, and we have been glad to recommend it to our constituents as such a magazine. The continued acceptance of such ads as the one mentioned above will make it impossible for us to continue considering *The Saturday Evening Post* as a magazine worthy of the commendation we have been giving it."